

No. 9. The polyporoid types of L veill  at Leiden.
Letter No. 36.

BY

C. G. LLOYD,

Cincinnati.

In the early days the old Dutch botanists made many collections of fungi in Java and other Dutch colonies in the East. With the exception of JUNGHUHN, they were not published by the collectors, but were vaguely named and preserved in the museum at *Leiden*. In this museum are many old collections by KORTHALS, BLUME, ZIPPELIUS and JUNGHUHN in the East, and MIQUEL in Surinam, but very few of them have the collector's name stated on the label.

L VEILL  visited the museum about 1844 and when he went back to *Paris* he published forty-five "new species" that he had noted in the museum at *Leiden*. He did not endorse his names on any of the labels, but he cited the collectors, often inaccurately I believe, and the names or numbers that the specimens bore. I have worked the collection over and by means of these citations have been able to identify the larger part of the types. It is possible that another search might produce others that I have overlooked, but I went carefully into the matter and believe that very few of those I did not find will ever be found or at least will ever be identified. In my opinion L VEILL  did about the poorest work in naming species of any of the old namers, always excepting KALCHBRENNER. At that time but few foreign species had been named, but L VEILL  did not seem to know even these few. In addition he often based species on very inadequate material, little abortive or undeveloped specimens that should not have been named at all. Recently all the Javanese specimens have been sent to BRESADOLA

and have been named by him. A number of LÉVEILLÉ'S "types" were thus correctly named, but in the renaming they lost their historical value, if LÉVEILLÉ'S work had any value.

There are five series of numbered boxes at *Leiden*, about a thousand altogether. LÉVEILLÉ'S "types" are distributed through these boxes, hence it was considerable labor to hunt them out, especially as they were not indicated in any particular way.

In the following synopsis I have noted in parentheses the original names or numbers cited by LÉVEILLÉ, and which have been my chief clue in identifying the types. Of course I have also taken LÉVEILLÉ'S "descriptions" into account to see that the specimens agree, or at least do not too strongly disagree. I have indicated in each case the box number so that it will be an easier task for the next man, if any one else ever thinks it is worth the trouble to hunt out LÉVEILLÉ'S "types."

abnormis (Sist, No. 33). Type not found but from LÉVEILLÉ'S remarks it was probably the common *Polistictus pergamenus*.

albo-marginatus (ZIPP. Mss.) Type in Box 51. It is the common *Fomes*, or perhaps *Polyporus*, with brick red context which occurs in the East and is better known and better called *Fomes Kermes* as BERKELEY named it. The white margin may have been "remarkable" at one time, but it is chiefly remarkable now by its total absence, as it is in all of the many specimens of this species that I have seen. To call the plant *albo-marginatus* is a case of following priority back to absurdity.

anisopilus (*pubescens*, FR.). Type in Box 5.* It so found in SACCARDO as *Fomes* (sic) and it is a *thin Polystictus*. It is rigid, sessile, has *gilvus* context and medium rigid pores. It has been renamed "*Trametes fuscella*, LÉV." It has no setae and is not a form of *gilvus*.

aulaxina (*lacerus*) as *Daedalea*. Type in Box 3.* It is a little fragment of a broad-gilled *Lenzites*, probably "*Platyphylla*, LÉV." as now named.

acuta (Kor. No. 29) as *Trametes*. Type not found.

atypus (Pol. No. 30). Type not found. There are two collections with this number but neither can possibly be the collections named.

auriculaeformis (JUNGH. Mss.). Type in box No. 77, not JUNG-HUHN'S writing, however. It is a single specimen, undoubtedly abnormally developed. It has the same context color and setae as *Polyporus gilvus* and may be an abnormal growth of this species.

Blumei (*Magamedon*). Type in Box 112. It is a thin, glabrous

Polystictus with shallow pores, which seems frequent in *Java*. There are several collections at Leiden, but in other museums this species is usually represented only by ZOLLINGER, Coll. No. 11.

Blumei (*viviparus*) as *Hexagona*. Type in Box. 183. In my opinion it is a thin, proliferous form of *Hexagona tenuis*.

cinerascens (Pol. No. 82). No type found by me. Specimens in Box 182. So named now and evidently taken as the type, but I think does not agree with the description nor can any connection be drawn from the old labeling.

confertus (*fumosus*, JUNGH.). Type in Box 29. I think it is a good species. ZOLL. 2d Coll. No. 44 is supposed to be the same thing and better specimens. It is a thin *Polystictus* with *gilvus* context and glabrous, rugulose surface. It has no setae.

convolutus (ZIPP. Mss.). Type in Box 169. I should refer it to a subproliferous or lacerated form of *Polystictus Blumei*.

dilatatus (Pol. *sector?*). Type in Box 178. It is now correctly referred to "*Polystictus Blumei*, L V." and it is surely the same plant.

flavida, *Daedalea* (KORTHALS). Type not found, but compare *lurida*.

Hasseltii (*mollis*, VAN HASSELT). Type not found by me.

Haskarl i (*ferrugineus*, JUNGH.). Types are in boxes 213* and 249, although labeled "*ferruginosus*" and probably not from JUNGHUHN. It is a common ferruginous *Fomes* in the East with abundant setae and is what I have heretofore been informed is *Fomes Korthalsii*. L VEILLE's measurements "4-5 cent." should be I think decimeters. This is evidently *Fomes Korthalsii* in the sense of L VEILLE's subsequent publications and of the ZOLLINGER collection, 872, named by L VEILLE, but not the original.

Junghuhnii (*Daed. betulina*, JUNGH.). *Lenzites*. Type not found.

Junghuhnii (Ins. *Bantam*) *Favolus*. Type in Box 209. This is a marked species and I think is the only specimen in any museum. It is a large species with the upper surface strongly "granular-squamulose," arranged in lines. The only similar species I have noted is *Polyporus fuscolineatus* (Type in Brit. Mus.).

Korthalsii (KORTH. No. 30). The type cited is in Box 23* and has recently been labeled "*Polyporus sideroides*, L V. form. *apoda*." I think that is correct although it is a plant of quite different appearance from the type of *Polyporus sideroides*. Both have the same context and abundant, globose, colored spores, 8-9 mic. (Compare *Polyporus sideroides*.) I believe that L VEILLE had *Haskarl i* confused with *Korthalsii* in his later publications and in his naming at *Paris* and in ZOLL. Coll. 872.

leptopilus (Pol. No. 3). Type not found.

lurida (No. 27) as *Daedalea*. The type in Box 143 is now labeled "*Daedalea flavida*, LÉV.=*Pol. lenziteus*, LÉV." I think that is correct, also it is in my opinion *ochroleuca*, LÉV., *Hobsonii*, BERK. and many other names.

Molkenboeri (*macrotrema*, JUNGH.) as *Hexagona*. Type in PERSOON'S Box 42. This was an unauthorized change of JUNGHUHN'S name to which JUNGHUHN naturally objected. (Cfr. Hex. Synopsis, p. 30 also Letter No. 37.

myrocyclus (ZIPP. Mss.). Type in Box 138=*Polystictus tabacinus* of MONTAGNE.

multiplex, *Favolus* (*Pol. cristatus*). Type in Box 58. I doubt very much if the American specimens usually referred to *Favolus multiplex* in the museums are correctly referred.

murinus (KORTHALS) as *Lenzites*. Type in Box 242. It is referred to *betulinus* now but I think is a good species. The gills are more of the nature of those of *Lenzites repanda*. The surface is very minutely tomentose, zoned. The context is isabelline.

murinus (*versicolor*, ZIPP.). No type found by me. The specimens in Box 137 so labeled now seem to answer LÉVEILLÉ'S description but were originally labeled "*Pol. eximius*" which LÉVEILLÉ referred to *Polyporus detonsus*. They are surely the same as *brunneolus* of BERKELY at Kew.

notopus (*proboscideus*, JUNGH.) No type found by me at Leiden. There is a specimen so named by LÉVEILLÉ at Paris, but it is too small and scanty to serve any purpose.

Pala (Herb. MIQUEL). Type not found.

peltatus (Fav. No. 4) as *Favolus*. Not found by me at Leiden. Specimen named bij LÉVEILLÉ at Paris is the same as *Favolus tessellatus*.

platyphylla (ZIPP. as *Daed.*) Type in PERSOON'S Box 53. It is a broad gilled, white *Lenzites*, a good species probably.

platypilus (*Pol. sanguineus*, JUNGH.). Type not found. There are a number of collections by JUNGHUHN of *Polystictus sanguineus*, but they are all correct and none are "50 cm." in diameter. LÉVEILLÉ'S description would point to *Polystictus Persoonii* though "pores minutissimus" hardly agrees.

plicatus (BLUME Mss.). Type not found.

perpusillus (PERS. Mss.). I saw this collection on a previous trip to Leiden but did not look it up this time. It is in PERSOON'S herbarium. It is a little *Fomes* but there is nothing to indicate that it came from "America boreali" as LÉVEILLÉ states, and to my knowledge it is not an American species.

pulchella (*Boletus apus* KUHL.) as *Hexagona*. Type not found at *Leiden*. There is a specimen labeled by L VEILL  in PATOILLARD'S herbarium (Cfr. Hex. synopsis, p. 25) but it does not agree with his description which was "zonis castaneis." In the original sense it seems to be a common species in the East and in Africa marked with a dark red stain, and is called in my pamphlet *Hexagona discopoda*, and is probably the same as *tricolor* of FRIES.

pusillus (PERS. Mss.), Type in PERSOON'S herbarium. It is the frequent little species of the tropics, well known under BERKELEY'S name *Polyporus Rhipidium*. (Cfr. Pol. Issue p. 33.)

rhodophaeus (*Rasa mala*, Jungh.) Type in Box 171 has been recently referred to *semilaccatus* of BERKELEY.

rigidus (Pol. No. 100). Type not found.

rugulosus (*monochrous*, MONT.? Pol. No. 57). Type not found by me though I think it must be in some box as there is an index sheet in the covers. This name has been lately taken as referring to the same plant as *Polyporus zonalis* of BERKELEY.

sideroides (Pol. No. 24 & 101, KORTH.) Type No. 24 is in Box 95. It is the most noteworthy species that L VEILL  named. In general appearance it reminds me of *Polyporus Schweinitzii*. It has a pleuropodal, *thick, spongy*, tomentose stipe. The context is ferruginous and the abundant spores are colored, globose, 8-9 mic. *Polyporus Korthalsii* in the original sense of L VEILL  is probably a sessile form of the same species. The only specimen I had previously seen of *Polyporus sideroides* is at *Kew*, named by L VEILL , and this has a short, lateral stipe. The best specimen of this species at *Leiden* is in Box 237.

splendens (*sericeus* v. *nitidus*). Type in Box 132.* It is the common *Polystictus pergamenus*.

splendens (Herb. MIQ.) as *Daedalea*. Type not found and probably could not be identified if it were.

tener (Sumatra, KORTHALS) as *Favolus*. Type not found.

tenuissimus (Pol. No. 4). Type not found.

trachodes (*tuberculosis*, JUNGH.) Type in Box. 34. It is now labeled correctly *Polyporus scruposus* which is a form of *Polyporus gilvus*.

vittata (KORTHALS) *Trametes*. Type not found.

[published 15 November 1912].